

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-18 are currently pending. Claims 1 and 16-18, which are independent, are amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at pages 23-24, and 31, and Figures 7 and 13.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

**II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101 AND §103(a)**

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,003,792 to Yuen (hereinafter, merely “Yuen”) in view U.S. Patent No. 5,920,354 to Fedele (hereinafter, merely “Fedele”).

### III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

#### A. Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 17 is amended, thereby obviating the rejections.

#### B. Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...processing means for processing the content data for increasing a resolution of the content data based on prediction taps and prediction coefficients,

wherein the first information and second information indicate a spatial resolution and a temporal resolution of the content data.” (Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Yuen and Fedele, taken either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above identified features of claim 1. Specifically, nothing in Yuen and Fedele discloses or suggests either:

1.) processing means for processing the content data for increasing a resolution of the content data based on prediction taps and prediction coefficients, and

2.) that the first information and second information indicate a spatial resolution and a temporal resolution of the content data,

both as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Yuen.

Since independent claims 16-18 are similar, or somewhat similar, in scope to claim 1, they are allowable.

C. Rejections Based on Official Notice Are Not Proper.

The Office Action (see page 8) rejects claims 7-12 based on Official Notice.

Applicants submit that the rejection based on Official Notice is improper because the features cited in claims 7-12 are not common knowledge of a person with ordinary skills in the art.

Claim 7 is directed to detecting, as a feature of the content data, the variance of image levels.

Claim 8 is directed to detecting, as a feature of the content data, the mean image level.

Claim 9 is directed to detecting environmental information, generating second information for each piece of detected environmental, and processing the content data using second information corresponding to the environmental information.

Claims 10 is directed to detecting, as the environmental information, the temperature in the ambient.

Claim 11 is directed to detecting, as the environmental information, the humidity in the ambient.

Claim 12 is directed to detecting, as the environmental information, the brightness of a light in the ambient.

Applicants submit that none of the features is common knowledge of a person of ordinary skills in the art of generating high definition signals. Therefore, references proving the Office Action's allegation are requested.

Furthermore, The Office Action fails to provide specific portions in the references to reject wherein the processing means calculates the prediction coefficients using the first information or the second information and generates pixel data of the high definition signal using the prediction coefficients, as recited in claim 1. The Office Action (see page 7) provides an incomplete statement for rejecting the above-identified features of claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 16-18 are patentable.

#### IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By



Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800